



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

PS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/394,824	09/13/1999	RICK CHIN	SOM-01601	4941
27383	7590	07/03/2006	EXAMINER	
CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP 31 WEST 52ND STREET NEW YORK, NY 10019-6131				NGUYEN, PHU K
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2628		

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/394,824	CHIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phu K. Nguyen	2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15, 17-42 and 45-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 13-15, 17, 18, 27-31, 34-42, 45-49, 55-61 and 2125 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 19, 20, 26, 32, 33 and 50-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

PHU.K. NGUYEN
 PRIMARY EXAMINER
 GROUP 2300

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 19, 20, 26, and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by SCHNEIDER et al. (6,222,551).

As per independent claim 19, Schneider et al teach a method implemented in a computer-aided design system of displaying a three-dimensional model (col.3, lines 19-26) having a plurality of two dimensional views associated therewith, each view comprising a representation of the three-dimensional model from a predetermined viewpoint (Figs.2A-2F; col.5, lines 57-61) comprising a step of rotating the three-dimensional model to present a first one of the views (col.7, lines 13-18; Fig.4B, J, K, col.7, lines 52-61), wherein views comprising views generated based on the three-dimensional model (Fig.4B, M, N, O, col.8, lines 35-39; col.9, lines 5-8), a step of pausing to show a first one of the views (Fig.4B, col .8, lines 40-46, i.e., showing the selected view at step Q and waiting for user to selecting a new view at step J), and a step of continuously rotating and pausing the model to present other ones of the views (Fig.4B, col.8, lines 43-46).

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS:

Applicant's arguments filed May 19, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant argues that Schneider does not teach "e representation of the 3D model from a predetermined viewpoint which is not correct in view of Schneider's six views (column 5, lines 54-63; in Schneider's parallel projection, the viewpoint is at infinitive) which are generated based on the 3D model (in Schneider, they are the left, right, top, bottom, back, front view of the 3D model). Further, Schneider teaches the selected view at step Q and waiting for user to selecting a new view at step J (or a step of pausing to show a first one of the views - Fig.4B, col .8, lines 40-46), and a step of continuously rotating and pausing the model to present other ones of the views (Fig.4B, col.8, lines 43-46). Accordingly, the claimed invention as represented in the claims does not represent a patentable distinction over the art of record.

As per dependent claim 20, Schneider et al further teach a step, in response to a user indicating that rotation of the three-dimensional model should stop, suspending rotation of the three-dimensional model until user indicates otherwise (Fig.4B, Q & J, i.e., suspending the rotation and displaying the image, i.e., "view", at the specified viewpoint until the user rotates the model in order to select a new viewpoint at step J).

As per dependent claim 26, Schneider et al further teach a step, in response to a presented view being section view, of removing a portion of the model to show the view (Fig.3A-3B, col .6, lines 12-16).

Claims 50-52 are similar to claims 19-20 and 26, respectively, Schneider et al further teach a data storage apparatus comprising instructions for causing a computer system to display a three dimensional model at col.3, lines 6-25.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 32-33 and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al. (6,222,551).

As per dependent claims 32-33 and 53-54, it should be noticed that Schneider et al fail to implicitly teach how the data file stored as now claimed, e.g., storing data defining each two dimensional view in a single file (claims 32 and 53) and data defining three dimensional model in a single file (claims 33 and 54). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the concept of storing data of each view in the single file and three dimensional data in a single file as now claimed into Schneider et al system in order to make it more efficient since it would have provided easiness to the operator in

Art Unit: 2628

organizing data in the huge database and would have enhanced the speed of retrieving data, e.g., only retrieving a file containing needy data according to the user selected viewpoint, i.e., a file containing data defining "TOPVIEW" or "BOTTOMVIEW" or "IFRONTVIEW" ... , for displaying on the screen as now claimed.

Claims 13-15, 17-18, 21-25, 27-31, 34-42, 45-49, 55-61 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 7645. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (571) 272 7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phu K. Nguyen
June 26, 2006

Phu Nguyen
PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2300